

THE HONORABLE JOHN C. COUGHENOUR

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

GEORGE VERKLER,

Defendant.

CASE NO. CR15-0041-JCC

ORDER

This matter comes before the Court on Defendant George Verkler's motion for return of property (Dkt. No. 103). Upon consideration of the motion and the relevant record, the Court DISMISSES the motion (Dkt. No. 103) for the reasons stated herein.

Mr. Verkler alleges the Government seized a large amount of money from his apartment that was not inventoried or presented for forfeiture in this case. (Dkt. No. 103 at 2–3.) The Court has repeatedly admonished Mr. Verkler that it no longer has jurisdiction to consider aspects of his criminal case that he has appealed. (*See, e.g.*, Dkt. No. 88 at 2) (citing *Griggs v. Provident Consumer Discount Co.*, 459 U.S. 56, 58 (1982)). While the Court could potentially consider a properly-supported post-conviction motion for return of property under Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 41(g), Mr. Verkler has not made such a motion. He fails to provide requisite “evidence on [all] factual [issues] necessary to decide the motion.” Fed. R. Crim. P 41(g). Instead, he merely repeats a number of unsupported allegations against the United States and the

1 Court, which this Court has repeatedly dismissed. (*See* Dkt. Nos. 103 at 1–2, 88 at 1, 3; Case No.  
2 C17-1876-JCC, Dkt. No. 5 at 3, 4.) Furthermore, Mr. Verkler’s allegations contradict stipulated  
3 facts in his plea agreement, including a list of specific items seized, which Mr. Verkler did not  
4 contest at the time. (*See* Dkt. No. 17 at 5, 8.) Accordingly, Mr. Verkler’s motion (Dkt. No. 103)  
5 is hereby DISMISSED.

6 DATED this 1st day of March 2018.

7  
8  
9 

10 John C. Coughenour  
11 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26